
From Slavophilism to Populism: A. P. Shchapov

The state, in its idea, is a lie.

—Konstantin Aksakov

When I studied the history [written by] Ustrialov and Karamzin, it always seemed to me strange that in it one could not find the history of rural Rus', the history of the masses, the history of the so-called simple black people. Can it be that this enormous majority is not entitled to culture, to historical development and significance?

—Afanasy Prokofevich Shchapov

Much of what was common to Slavophile and Populist aspiration was finally the result of two extremely important historical peculiarities in Russia's development: the cultural discontinuities resulting from the reforms of Peter the Great and Russia's rapid Westernization; and the enormous part played by the state in Russian development—from the programmatic borrowing of navigational techniques and poetic genres in the eighteenth century to the rapid industrial development in the last twenty-five years of the imperial regime. Taken together, classical Slavophilism and Populism are part of a fitful reaction in Russian culture against the state as the sponsor of a modernity regarded as alien. Populism evolved, in part, out of Slavophilism, in the atmosphere that developed after the Crimean defeat, and was vitally condi-

tioned by the social optimism of the first part of the reign of Alexander II. Chernyshevsky gave Populist ideas a more Western orientation by softening the anarchist, antistatist implications of Slavophilism, by virtually eliminating the messianic sense of Russia's "specialness," and by ceasing to speak of her separate path. Although a good many of Chernyshevsky's followers were both more anarchist and more nationalist than he, on the whole it was the Western elements in Populism that were strengthened in the 1870s and 1880s (particularly with the arrival of Marxism as a rival blueprint for the intelligentsia), but it never lost the essential stamp it had received at the hands of Herzen and Ogarëv.

On the more prosaic and concrete level of individual lives, however, the connection between the two was more veiled. Classical Slavophilism as a system of thought had many fewer adherents at the height of its influence than Populism was to achieve. And most of the Populist radicals of the 1860s and 1870s were either indifferent to Slavophilism or hostile to it; what was likely to strike them about it was its chauvinistic potential, its social quietism, and its origins in the gentry salons of the pre-1848 period. And as the gentry culture of the "fathers" (even in its most radical form) became odious to younger radicals, the Slavophile roots of Populism became ever harder to discern. But in retrospect it is clear that most of the Populist Left between 1861 and 1881 experienced Slavophilism in the radical form created by Herzen and developed by Chernyshevsky; this was the intellectual bridge between the Slavophiles and the emerging world of radical Populism.

In certain individual lives, however, one can see how Slavophilism evolved into Populism, how someone moved from the force field of one system into another. One of the most interesting cases is that of Pavel Nikolaevich Rybnikov, one of the most important collectors of folk songs in all nineteenth-century Russia. From a family of Old Believer Moscow merchants, Rybnikov was educated in a Moscow gymnasium, from which he graduated with distinction in 1850. After a lengthy European tour, during which he served a rich family as an interpreter, he

entered the University of Moscow in the fall of 1854, several years before the general ferment there began.¹

The Russian merchant class was notably late in achieving cultural or political self-consciousness; the plays of Aleksandr Ostrovsky render the social and political "backwardness" of the merchant class in telling and not unfair terms. Rybnikov's family, however, was unusually cultivated and self-aware—and quite well-to-do. They nourished their son's interest in national minorities and regional peculiarities, as well as his special interest in Old Believers. They must also have instilled in him his love of books; by the time he finished the university in mid-1858, he was notably well read, not only in folklore, literature, and theology, but in writers of the Hegelian tradition (including Ludwig Feuerbach and Max Stirner), French socialist thought, and such comparatively obscure figures as Giovanni Battista Vico.

Apparently, Rybnikov was already intellectually and personally close to the Khomiakov family when he arrived at the university. He tutored the sons of A. S. Khomiakov and spent time during the summer on his estate. He also came to know the Aksakov brothers and Iury Samarin—friends who were to be invaluable to him at crucial junctures in his career. But while there is no question that Rybnikov's initial impulse toward the study of popular life was actively encouraged by Khomiakov's view of the peasant as the embodiment of old Russian religiosity and communalism, by the time we have any hard evidence about their relationship (around 1855–56), Khomiakov and Rybnikov had become friendly enemies.

Rybnikov became a leading light in one of the student groups that first developed a distinctly "Populist" outlook; he and his friends formed their views in frequent evening discussions, which often included Khomiakov, Konstantin Aksakov, and on at least one occasion Samarin. The student members of the group (which was not closed to outsiders and hence was soon penetrated by the police) called themselves the *vertepniki*, from an obscure Slavic word (*vertep*) that had come to be an underworld term for a den of thieves. They met in small student apartments

and attic rooms (most often Rybnikov's) and discussed the social and political issues of the day. They considered themselves republicans; several, including Rybnikov, adopted Feuerbach's views on religion; they had progressive views on the family and the emancipation of women. But the heart of their discussions, even before peasant emancipation became a live issue, was the future of the Russian village and the essential character of the peasantry. Was the peasant, as Khomiakov tirelessly argued, the bearer of a deeply religious culture? Or was he (as the *vertepniki* were reading in the *Bell*) an unself-conscious socialist? It is pleasant to imagine Khomiakov, then in his fifties and accustomed to all the amenities of Moscow salon life, sitting up till all hours with these poor students, drinking tea out of cracked cups and passing the single spoon from hand to hand—patiently, if unsuccessfully, arguing his case against Feuerbach's atheism and for the traditional family structure. All the participants in these evening marathons could agree, however, on the necessity of studying the *narod* at first hand, and everyone could agree on the central importance of the peasant commune.

Other influential *vertepniki* were A. A. Kozlov, who subsequently abandoned radicalism and became a philosophy professor at the University of Kiev, and Matvei Sviridenko, a passionate student of popular folkways, who ran a radical bookstore in St. Petersburg and died in 1864. Rybnikov and Sviridenko were, together with P. I. Iakushkin, the first Russians to put on contemporary peasant costume for their ethnographic expeditions into the countryside. Their peasant dress was more than a collector's strategy—it was a political statement: they were already “going to the people,” to use a phrase that came into vogue only later.

In the winter of 1859, after his graduation from the university, Rybnikov was arrested while on an ethnographic foray among the Old Believers of Chernigov province*—under highly suspicious circumstances. He had a commission from a magazine, but he was dressed in peasant clothes; when asked for his (internal)

*The mid-seventeenth-century Schism (*Raskol*) in the Russian Church was occasioned by “corrections” in the prayer books and manuals, ordered by the Patriarch Nikon, a Greco-phile. Those of the Russian clergy and laity who refused to accept these changes became known as Old Ritualists or Old Believers.

passport, he could produce only a letter from Khomiakov.* The government was edgy and intensely suspicious of "ill-intentioned persons" stirring up trouble among the serfs, who were soon to be emancipated; and Rybnikov's radical opinions were known to the authorities. If Khomiakov had not brought his considerable influence to bear, Rybnikov might well have spent some time in jail. As it was, he was sentenced to administrative exile in Petrozavodsk, on Lake Onega, several hundred kilometers northeast of St. Petersburg.

Rybnikov remained in Petrozavodsk for seven years. He was given an undemanding job by the reform-minded governor in the provincial bureaucracy, and he divided his time between charming the local society and wandering among the peasants. In doing so, he made a discovery of enormous importance in the history of Russian folklore. He found out that the *byliny*, or epic-historical songs (some of which could be traced back as far as the eleventh century), were still part of the oral tradition in the area, and the versions that he published between 1861 and 1867 electrified the scholarly world. Rybnikov transcribed more than two hundred texts, and the collectors who followed him added many more.

Neither Rybnikov's radicalism nor his interest in folklore survived much beyond his thirty-fifth birthday. In 1866, thanks to his Slavophile friends Ivan Aksakov and Iury Samarin, he obtained a good position in the Russian administration in Poland. Little is known of his later career, beyond a skeleton of dates. He did come to be much interested in Tolstoy's ideas, and one writer refers to him as a "Christian anarchist," although evidently he was a secret one. He seems to have become progressively more pessimistic about his country, coming to believe (like Pëtr Chaadaev) that Russian life was hopelessly lacking in intellectual continuity and tradition. "It is nauseating for a cultivated man to live in Russian society" was his final recorded word on the subject.² He died in 1885, a successful functionary but a disappointed man.

*According to police reports, Rybnikov was asking the Old Believers about "the ancient rights and customs of the Russian people." See M. M. Klevenky, "Vertepniki," *Katorga i ssylka*, No. 47, p. 26.

The central point at issue between Rybnikov and his Slavophile friends boiled down to who the Russian peasant really was—to the *narodnost*, or national essence, of the Russian people, in the Romantic vocabulary of the time. In the case of Rybnikov and other more-or-less radical students of the peasantry, their sense of this peasant *narodnost* gradually changed: the emphasis on the religious and the traditional fell away; the peasant ceased to be regarded as submissive, becoming dignified and resolute instead. As the peasant came to be viewed as inherently rebellious, his monarchism was temporarily forgotten; young collectors from the universities began to ask the peasants to sing songs about Stenka Razin, Pugachëv, and other rebels and bandits.

This intellectual shift cannot be understood without reference to the general intellectual ferment of the times, to the surge of social optimism and above all the excitement generated by the Emancipation. People like Rybnikov did not embrace Populism by self-consciously turning their Slavophile coats or by moving from one “camp” to another (to employ the militaristic terminology favored by Soviet historians), but in amorphous and unconscious ways. They had never been *wholly* “Slavophile,” and there was not yet a category such as “Populist.” But their view of the peasant, their sense of the essence of the *narod*, was changing.

Afanasy Shchapov is a more substantial figure in the history of Russian radicalism than Rybnikov, and a consideration of his career and writings illuminates a number of these connections. Shchapov has been a relatively neglected figure among the Russian radicals of the 1860s.³ Very little of what he wrote dealt with the social and political problems of the day; he does not seem to have had a serious connection with Land and Liberty or any other actively conspiratorial group; furthermore, in 1863 he rather abruptly abandoned his Populist historical outlook and became a naive believer in “scientific” history, in the manner of Henry Buckle, attempting to derive the march of social progress from race, geography, and climate.

Yet on the basis of his early work Shchapov has an excellent

claim to be called the historian of Populism. More than any other serious practitioner, he took the key ideas and themes of early Populism and gave a reading of Russian history in these terms. And in Shchapov's historical work, the intellectual kinship of Slavophilism and Populism is as clearly expressed as it is in Herzen.

Shchapov was born on October 5, 1830, in the small town of Anga, in the depths of Siberia, not far from Irkutsk. He was the son of a poor sacristan and his Buriat wife, who would have been regarded by most non-peasant Russians as a "native." His father's family was of Great Russian stock; they had migrated to Siberia at the end of the seventeenth century, or been sent there in connection with the Schism (*Raskol*) in the Russian Church. His parents planned to make young Afanasy a priest, so they sent him, at the age of nine, to the ecclesiastical boarding school, or bursa, in Irkutsk. Such institutions tended to be the epitome of material squalor and pedagogical backwardness;⁴ the one in Irkutsk was "one of the worst schools in Russia." The little boys who were lodged there suffered from filth, insufficient clothing, rats, lice, and mange, poor food, and so on. They had almost no books, and the school couldn't even manage spoons for the miserable meals. Beatings were the customary form of punishment, and for an offense of some seriousness the corporal punishment was turned into a public affair, with not only the students present but townspeople as well. Any historian setting out to investigate the prominence of the children of priests among Russian radicals in the nineteenth century would do well to study such schools.

Shchapov's identification with the peasantry and his hatred of coercive authority probably owed something to the contrast between his poor but happy home (where his mother "always wore the local peasant costume") and the oppressive life of the school; Shchapov's biographer, N. Ia. Aristov, suggests perhaps a bit fancifully that his subsequent sympathy for peasant flight from the Russian state, as a historical phenomenon, was rooted in his understanding of what motivated the frequent runaways from the bursa, his first experience with nonfamilial, "external" authority.⁵

Between 1846 and 1852, Afanasy attended the seminary in Irkutsk, which seems to have been an improvement on the bursa; we know very little about his days there, except that he was already interested in history and is reported to have read Nikolai Karamzin's classic *History of the Russian State* while in residence.⁶

In 1852, at the age of almost twenty-two, Shchapov went to the Ecclesiastical Academy at Kazan'; there were four such schools in Russia, and they were the topmost rung of the educational ladder for members of the clerical estate. The young man's remarkable intellectual qualities must already have attracted the attention of his teachers. The academy was run by monks, but most of its teachers were lay, and some of them were rather progressive, in the manner of the Westerners of the 1840s. Interest in Hegel was widespread, and A. F. Gusev, the professor of physics, was putting his students on to Feuerbach—the most direct kind of challenge to the views of the clerical administration.⁷ Some students knew the work of Herzen and Belinsky, and copies of the *Contemporary* and the *Annals of the Fatherland* circulated clandestinely.

It is from these years, the early and mid-1850s, that we have our first real impressions of young Shchapov from his contemporaries; he was a most unusual student. He is remembered as extremely naive, childlike, and unself-conscious. He was nervous and lively in his manner, passionately sincere and direct in his conversation, and remarkably untidy, both in appearance and in his manner of life. In a world dominated by hierarchy, he was seemingly unaware of it: he talked in the same sweet, sincere, and unaffected way to the rector of the academy as to his fellow students. He seems to have gotten away with it largely because he was such a transparently good-natured person that everyone could see no disrespect was intended.

Another factor that helped to shield Shchapov from the displeasure of the authorities, and even to some extent from the cruel jokes of his comrades, was his obvious scholarly aptitude and his extraordinary capacity for work. He would be pointed out to incoming students as an academic prodigy, the like of which

had never before been seen at the academy. He was supposed to be working seventeen hours a day—perhaps he actually did so. In any case, he was heavily engaged with the classics of Russian history—Karamzin, thick volumes by Mikhail Pogodin—and he threw himself avidly upon each successive volume of Sergei Solov'ëv's monumental *History of Russia* as they appeared in the 1850s. He also ransacked the library for primary sources, and was renowned for having spent countless hours poring over the enormous code of Russian laws, as well as the early chronicles.

Because of this unheard-of zeal and energy, his contemporaries plagued him less than might have been expected, linking him humorously but half-seriously with patristic scholarship and the heroic traditions of Eastern Orthodox asceticism: he was known as "the New Stylite" and "the Blessed Afanasy." An ascetic he certainly was at that time. In addition to his famous work habits, he was known to be frightened of women, shy and awkward in any social situation, and unable to stand the taste—or even smell—of any alcoholic beverage. He considered becoming a monk, he said, because he could see little difference between a monk's life and a scholar's.

Ordinary boys were quite incapable of not teasing such a creature, and from time to time Afanasy had to defend himself in the time-honored fashion. This he was able to do. Although he was practically impervious to the routine of mild ridicule, when he decided that he had been insulted he could lose his temper utterly; on such occasions his usual manner of shy seriousness completely disappeared and he became a formidable fighter.

As far back in Shchapov's life as the historian can penetrate, he was noted for his pride in his peasant ancestry, in a time and place when such an attitude was highly unusual. Most of Shchapov's contemporaries at the bursa and the seminary were also the sons of parish clergy, whose family's way of life was close to that of their peasant flock. Slurs and insults about peasant crudity and stupidity were common enough, both from the monkish administrators and from a few of the more well-to-do students. When such remarks were made, Shchapov was likely to lose his temper and come out swinging. Certainly his sense of

identification with the peasantry—and with all of its suffering and neglect throughout Russian history—was something that drew him to Slavophilism and then to more radical and political forms of Slavophile ideas. The Crimean War occasioned, at the academy as elsewhere in Russia, a mood that mixed Russian nationalism with an angry and frustrated criticism of the government. The war seems to have hit Shchapov hard: he wept bitterly, after the fall of Sevastopol, at the senseless death of so many brave Russian peasant boys.

It is difficult to piece together the attitude of the clerical administration toward their young prodigy. The picture of these men that emerges in the skimpy historical literature on the academy is deeply negative. In particular, Grigory, the rector when Shchapov arrived and subsequently archbishop of Kazan', seems to have been an obscurantist bully. Imbued with a deep hatred of all secular culture, he seems to have conceived his job in completely supervisory and police terms: prowling the corridors and classrooms (and occasionally the streets of Kazan') during the day and the dormitories at night, in the nineteenth-century equivalent of sneakers, looking for truants, absentees, smokers, novel-readers, and other violators of the academy's severe and complicated rules. And a number of his subordinates were of a like disposition, if somewhat less vigilant and energetic.⁸

The monks were probably a bit more tolerant of Shchapov's simplicity, spontaneity, and tendency to lose himself in his work (and not show up in class) than one might have expected. Perhaps this was largely the response to his remarkable naiveté and good humor; perhaps they hoped, as schoolmasters do, that their star pupil would bring laurels to the academy and to them. In fact they furthered his career, and at certain moments he got real support from one or two men. Even the much-reviled Grigory took some interest in Shchapov's work and actually suggested what became the topic of his master's thesis: the Church Schism of the seventeenth century.* In 1857, the new rector of the acad-

*Although he later criticized it for its deviation from clerical orthodoxy. See N. Ia. Aristov, *Afanasii Prokofevich Shchapov. Zhizn' i sochineniia* (St. Petersburg, 1883), p. 14.

emy, Ioann Sokolov, became a close friend, advising and counseling the young scholar and trying to help him in the struggle with his developing personal problems.*

Our knowledge of Shchapov's relations with the faculty is only slightly fuller. When he arrived at the academy, the teacher of Russian history was G. Z. Eliseev, who left Kazan' in 1856 to join the young radical writers on the staff of the *Contemporary*.⁹ Eliseev and Shchapov subsequently came to know each other quite well in St. Petersburg in the early 1860s, but Eliseev left the academy just as Shchapov was beginning to reach out beyond its conventional clerical world view, and there is no evidence that he played much part in Shchapov's education to radicalism. After his departure, Russian history was taught for a time by I. P. Gvozdev, of whom Shchapov was very fond; he called him "Grampa," although Gvozdev was still a young man. But Gvozdev knew little enough about Russian history; he made competent lectures out of Solov'ëv and other historians of the "state school" for his classes. As Shchapov was busy defining his views *against* Solov'ëv, Gvozdev could hardly have been a real intellectual influence.

A more important figure was S. T. Eshevsky, of whom Shchapov saw a good deal in the mid-1850s. Eshevsky, a student of Granovsky, was then a docent at the University of Kazan'. Subsequently the author of a major study of the relationship between the central government and the provinces of the Roman Empire, Eshevsky seems to have focused Shchapov's inchoate predilection for local and regional freedom in Russia into a more definite contrast between peasant society and state power. He suggested that Shchapov turn his attention to Russian colonization of the northeast, and directed the young historian's attention to the cadastral surveys (*pistsovye knigi*), compiled at the order of the various regional princes in the Middle Ages, as

*A lighter side of the relationship is revealed in an anecdote recorded by Aristov. On one occasion, the two men were out walking together when they met a group of drunken peasants, staggering along, arm in arm, and singing at the top of their lungs. "There's the vital force of your black people [peasants]," observed the rector with a smile. "But they're still better than we are," replied Shchapov. "They don't let each other fall, but even when we're sober we're always ready to trip each other up." *Ibid.*, p. 45.

a valuable historical source. Shchapov later made this stress on colonization a vital part of his view of Russian historical development, in opposition to those historians who stressed the consolidation of state power.¹⁰ Unfortunately, a foolish quarrel over the use of historical documents terminated the relationship between the two men, even before Eshevsky was called to the University of Moscow in 1857. Shchapov was increasingly prone to such quarrels as he achieved greater academic renown.

In 1857, Alexander I proclaimed the coming demise of serfdom and commitment to reform. For the first time in his life Shchapov became interested in contemporary affairs, but not surprisingly he initially interpreted the edict in such a way as to reinforce his belief in the essential benevolence of the Russian Church and state. By the time of his instructorship at the academy, almost two years later, however, Shchapov's belief in the Tsar Liberator was exhibiting signs of strain.

At about the same time as his friendship with Eshevsky was at its height, and rumors of Emancipation were in the air, Shchapov began to be seriously interested in Slavophile views of Russian history.¹¹ Through 1856, he read the Slavophile periodical *Russian Colloquy* (*Russkaia beseda*) avidly, and discussed the ideas he found there with anyone who would listen. A highlight of that year in the journal's pages was the controversy between the statist historian Sergei Solov'ëv and Konstantin Aksakov over the meaning of Moscow's "gathering of the Russian lands" and the Muscovite autocracy in Russian history.

To Solov'ëv, the sixth volume of whose monumental *History of Russia* had just appeared, the Russian state and the Russian nation were inseparable; the history of Russia *was* the history of the development of the Russian state. Although positivist in his practice, Solov'ëv believed in Hegel's "world-historical individuals," and it is with the rulers and state-builders that he was principally concerned. Although Solov'ëv criticized Karamzin on many points, both believed in the autocracy: the central role of the state in modern Russian life was faithfully, if variously, reflected by nineteenth-century historians.

In no other Slavophile did opposition to the state take a purer,

more dogmatic, or more utopian form than in the writings of Konstantin Aksakov.¹² He saw all of Russian historical development as conditioned by the unique relationship between the state and what he called "the land" (*zemlia*). At one level, the distinction was simply between the limited political jurisdiction of state power before Peter the Great, performing the essential function of protecting society, and that society itself—religious, communal, and free. At another level, however, the land embodied the timeless moral truth of Christianity, issuing in peaceful, communitarian social forms, while the state, in Andrzej Walicki's trenchant phrase, was an "artificial, mechanical and external structure."¹³ Necessary for the preservation of the land, it represented a "lower" principle, one that was necessitated by human imperfection, by the fact that man was a fallen creature. Nicolas Berdyaev is quite correct in noting that "the Slavophiles had no love for the State and authority; they saw evil in all authority. . . . The monarchical doctrine of the Slavophiles fundamentally and in its inward pathos was anarchist and a product of their revulsion from authority."¹⁴ Behind Aksakov's static "Christian people's utopia" lay the Romantic hatred of social and political rationalism that animated all the early Slavophiles.

In his polemic with Solov'ëv,¹⁵ Aksakov stressed, in a way that must have appealed to Shchapov, the fact that the common people were absent from Solov'ëv's volumes: such an account of Russian history was ludicrously incomplete. He was outraged at Solov'ëv's vague Hegelian optimism: history should be written in relation to truth and to its national expression, not in accord with the notion that things were getting better and better all the time—especially when one meant by that essentially that state power was growing and consolidating. Aksakov found that Solov'ëv was ultimately a mere apologist for the reforms of Peter the Great—which Aksakov believed had destroyed the crucial harmony between state and land, and which he condemned even more bitterly than did Khomiakov or Kireevsky, seeing them as a violent intrusion of the state into the affairs of the land that led to the cultural enslavement of the Russian gentry to the rationalist cosmopolitanism of the West.

Shchapov read other historical works with a Slavophile point of view. He was fascinated by the work of Vladimir Leshkov, a now-forgotten legal historian at the University of Moscow. In 1856, Leshkov published a book entitled *The Social Customs of Ancient Russia*, in which he investigated the territorial extent of the ancient Russian princedoms that had been absorbed by Moscow.¹⁶ Two years later, Leshkov followed with *The Russian People and the State*, a most Aksakovian work, over which Shchapov pored for several months. From this period dates Shchapov's fascination with the old Assemblies of the Russian Land (*Zemskie sobory*), which Aksakov regarded as crucial in the relationship between state and land, for at these assemblies, called by the monarch and generally organized by estate—gentry, clergy, merchants, peasants—the spirit and opinions of the land informed and guided the deliberations and actions of the state. Aksakov also spoke of the peasant commune (*mir*) and the urban popular assembly (*veche*) as crucial expressions of the ancient Russian *Volksgeist*.

It was some time, however, before either Shchapov's excitement about the Emancipation or his interest in Slavophile literature found much expression in his work. Perhaps one reason for this circumstance may be found in Shchapov's friendship with Ioann Sokolov, the rector of the academy, who was a strong-minded man, committed to historical scholarship but unsympathetic to "democratism," even of the Slavophile variety.

In 1858, Shchapov's master's dissertation appeared as a book, under the lengthy title *The Russian Schism of the Old Ritualists, Examined in Relation to the Internal Condition of the Russian Church and Citizenry in the Seventeenth Century and in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. An Historical Essay on the Causes of the Origin and Spread of the Schism*. The thesis was based on a large cache of documents that the fortunes of the Crimean War had brought to Kazan'. The large library collection of the Solovetsky Monastery on the White Sea, an early center of the Old Belief, had been transported to Kazan', apparently for fear it would be damaged by the British, and Shchapov, with his

familial connection to the Old Believers and his love of documents, had explored its riches.

The published thesis attracted a good deal of critical attention, although the reviews were mixed, and it quickly went into a second edition.¹⁷ In retrospect, one can see that Shchapov's viewpoint was not only confused but clearly transitional. On the one hand, he tended to dismiss the ostensible cause of the Schism: Patriarch Nikon's reform of the Church books. He regarded the schismatics as social rebels protesting against the consolidation of serfdom, the upper classes, and (subsequently) the innovations of Peter the Great. Nikon's harshly imposed changes in liturgy and service books were the cultural expression of violations of an older order, conceived as communal and harmonious. But Shchapov defended Nikon and the Church establishment. He also linked the Schism to the massive peasant rebellion of Stenka Razin, in which many Old Believers took part, but resolutely condemned this "democratic protest." Small wonder that radical reviewers, like Nikolai Dobroliubov and M. A. Antonovich on the *Contemporary*, found the material fascinating but the treatment confused and, on balance, obscurantist.

Also on the basis of documents from the Solovetsky library, Shchapov published between 1857 and 1861 some ten or twelve articles in the Kazan' academy's own journal, the *Orthodox Interlocutor* (*Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*). (Rector Sokolov's influence on this journal was clear: he was determined to give it scholarly integrity and intellectual seriousness, and for a time he succeeded.) Shchapov's articles dealt primarily with monasteries and monastic teachers as disseminators of culture and enlightenment in pre-Petrine Russia, and there is little trace of an oppositional point of view, although the criticism of serfdom is clear.¹⁸ But in Shchapov's performance as a teacher and lecturer at the academy in those years, we get a far more vivid sense of the changes taking place in his intellectual outlook and personality. In the early summer of 1856, Shchapov was offered and accepted a post as instructor (*bakkalavr*) in Russian history at the academy. He worked furiously on his lectures that summer, but with the confidence that his new position gave him came a new socia-

bility. And in order to keep going at his desk for long hours, he began to add rum to his many cups of strong tea—a fateful development, as things turned out.

As a lecturer, Shchapov was an inconsistent performer. On occasion he would produce a completely original, finished, and exciting piece of work that he would deliver to the students with an enthusiasm they found irresistible. But if he had been working all night on an article, he might simply string together a list of facts, or talk off the top of his head about his work, or not show up in class at all. Initially, the students were sympathetic. They knew how hard he was working; indeed, he became dependent on them to bring him new pens and sheets of paper, which he rapidly covered with his almost illegible scrawl, turning out his articles and lectures. His manner, both in and out of class, was simple and direct, and the students responded well.

As late as the early fall of 1858, Shchapov's eccentricities were still under control; his drinking was moderate. But within a year he admitted that he suffered on occasion from delirium tremens, and before the year 1859 was out, he had become an alcoholic. He had always been a passionate and sentimental person, prone to outbursts of weeping and occasional violent abuse. Under the influence of alcohol these aspects of his personality became increasingly extreme. He became more and more arrogant about his intellectual abilities, often exploding into wild and abusive tirades at students or colleagues, or at the miserable state of Russian society. After these tantrums were over, he would weep bitterly over his lonely life, his lack of self-control and penchant for self-destruction.

How his political radicalization dovetailed with his growing personal problems is difficult to spell out,* but they became simultaneously more apparent. He seems to have lost faith in the progress of Emancipation, and more than once spoke of his desire to address the Emperor directly about the misery of the

*One reason for this difficulty is that Aristov's book, our only good source for this period of Shchapov's life, was published in 1883, a politically conservative period when no treatment in print of Shchapov's radicalization was really possible. Aristov had to confine himself to Shchapov's dislike of bureaucracy, concern about the state of the country, and so on. But the drift of his remarks is unmistakable. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

peasantry. He began to denounce the gentry and the bureaucrats in his lectures; the opposition of the *narod*'s sincerity and truth-seeking to the hypocrisy of officialdom—certainly a Slavophile-Populist theme—came to obsess him. At the same time he seems to have become more nationalist, and his conversation was laced with criticism of Western cosmopolitanism. He had never been much interested in European history or languages; his apathy now turned to active dislike. His relationship with his students also deteriorated between 1858 and 1861. By now they were upset by his irregular habits, and groups of them visited him to discuss their grievances. His tantrums grew worse: he would tear his clothes, rip books and manuscripts to pieces, and literally chase the students away. But after these outbursts were over, he would still be capable of periods of sustained work and creativity. Most of what he later published in the periodicals of Moscow and St. Petersburg originated in this period.

Basic to Shchapov's Populist vision was a Manichaeian dualism derived from Aksakov's distinction between the state and the land. Aksakov thought the reign of Peter the Great had suddenly shattered the preexistent harmony between the two, but Shchapov read the struggle much further back into Russian history.¹⁹ The whole long process of the rise of Moscow, beginning in the fourteenth century, he believed, was freighted with dire consequences for Russian society.

Russia's "natural" development took the form of a slow process of colonization along the rivers of the north. The small social units that replicated themselves in this process were communal in their internal life and tended to be autochthonous. Trade and handicrafts developed from below, strictly in accordance with local needs. In sketching out this historical development, Shchapov laid great stress on all the communal forms of social decision-making for which any evidence could be found in the sources: the village communal meeting (*mirskoi skhod*, *skhodka*), the urban popular assembly (*veche*), the regional council (*zemskii sovet*), and at the national level, the Assembly of the Land (*Zemskii sobor*),²⁰ which became, during the period of Moscow's triumph, a kind of heir to the earlier forms. During

the so-called Appanage Period (roughly encompassing the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), when the country was largely governed by various local princes, a loose, federative alliance of small units prevailed, Shchapov believed, and the vital and harmonious life of society was not infringed upon by the state. Thus did Shchapov, with his localism and hostility to the state, glorify a period that most Russian historians have found at best transitional and at worst repulsive, because of the absence of state power. (Russian historians, more than most, hate it when their country is "weak.") But as Moscow began to increase its power over the other cities and augment the territory under its control, an alien, "outside" force began to menace the autonomy of society: the centralized autocracy.

Despite the trappings of scholarly objectivity, these articles are obviously and profoundly of their time; the anarchist spirit that lurks behind the stress on "regionalism" and "federalism" is close in spirit to Herzen; no wonder he liked them.* As the German scholar Josef Wachendorf has perceptively pointed out, Shchapov's concepts of "federation" and "federalism" are not really political and certainly not legal; they are heavily laden with ethical-social content: love, mutual solidarity, equality.²¹ Their basis is the family, the most elementary "federation," and all the other, more extensive social organizations are permeated with its spirit. The political power and importance of the princes is unjustifiably minimized in Shchapov's work; the importance of the *veche* and other "democratic" organs is grossly exaggerated. These articles are the work of a nineteenth-century *intelligent*, trying to establish the historical existence of a libertarian and communal golden age—with definite implications for the future of Russia. It is as impossible to support Shchapov's view of Old Russia as to endorse the idealized tableaux of Kireevsky or Aksakov.

Shchapov believed Russian history in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had been dominated by the struggle between

*Herzen's letter to Shchapov, which the latter received in the fall of 1861, has unfortunately not survived. Aristov, who had a copy of it, recorded Herzen's praise of Shchapov's historical articles; Herzen called Shchapov's voice "fresh, pure and powerful." *Ibid.*, p. 74.

Moscow and Novgorod. In his terms, both contained "federative" elements, but he idealized Novgorod as a "federalistic democracy," taking note of the importance of the Novgorod *veche*, but failing to see that Novgorod's rule over its large empire was in significant respects as high-handed as Moscow's.²²

Shchapov regarded the reign of Ivan the Terrible (1533–84) as the first great triumph of the state; it was followed, however, by a major reaction. What happened during the Time of Troubles (1606–13), in Shchapov's view, was that regionalism—largely in the form of feuding and civil war, to be sure—reasserted itself against Muscovite centralization. Crucial to his analysis are the contacts, agreements, and informal alliances among the cities and regions of Russia that came to the fore in the struggles against the Poles and the unruly cossack bands. In 1613, with the Poles stymied and social chaos, for the moment, in abeyance, the various regions of Russia reconstituted themselves, through a *Zemskii sobor*, into a federal state. Tragically for Russia, however, this momentary success was undone by the reassertion of Muscovite centralization that followed. Shchapov did not make clear the dynamics of the process, and he left the way clear to "blame" retrograde, antinational social elements: the dynasty, realizing an unnatural dictatorship through the rationalist techniques of Western European statecraft, and the gentry, establishing their regime of economic privilege and power on the ruins of communal and democratic life.

It must be said that there *was* a regional dimension to the alliance that repelled the Polish invaders and convened the *Zemskii sobor*; and no doubt more people became involved in military and political decision-making than had been the case for centuries. But was this not simply an emergency, *ad hoc* federalism, created by the virtual disintegration of the central authority, rather than the reassertion (whatever processes may be concealed within that global term) of some ancient set of historical "principles"? The failure of the *Zemskii sobor* and other local deliberative bodies to achieve a solid institutional base in the seventeenth century was certainly related to the resurgence of autocratic power, but an observer not morally and politically

committed to Shchapov's regional and federal principles is likely to conclude that the autocracy has a better claim to be elevated to the status of a "principle" of Russian history than whatever underlay the *Zemskii sobor* or the peasant commune. Solov'ëv's statism in the end tells us more of Russia's actual historical development than the quite opposite mythologies generated by Slavophilism and (later) Populism.

The increasingly erratic rhythms of Shchapov's life were interrupted, in the summer of 1860, by the first of a series of events that moved him to a larger stage. On August 3, N. A. Popov, an associate professor of history at the University of Kazan', was called to a professorship in Moscow and recommended Shchapov as his replacement. The appointment, on a one-year trial basis, cleared the University Council and was approved by the Ministry of Education.

The University of Kazan' was one of the smallest and poorest of Russia's institutions of higher education.²³ It served primarily the Volga region and Siberia (an enormous area), and enrollment fluctuated between 320 and 400 in the years 1855-61. Although students of gentry origin predominated, the percentage of lower-class students was higher than at other Russian universities, as was the percentage enrolled for professional training in the faculties of law and medicine.²⁴ The Kazan' students seem to have been exceptionally belligerent during this period; conflicts with the police were ugly, and relations with the faculty poor, in part because of the uneven quality of the teaching staff and the presence on it of a number of foreigners who spoke Russian badly.

After 1855, student corporatism in Kazan' developed even more rapidly than elsewhere, due in part to the small size of the student body and the constant conflicts with the faculty and educational administration, which notably lacked the kind of sympathetic moderates to be found in St. Petersburg. Student courts and libraries soon made their appearance, and *skhodki* became the favorite means of discussing issues and mobilizing the students. The *kassa* for poor students was generously endowed by the more well-to-do, and handwrit-

ten newssheets and forbidden books became commonplace.

The educational bureaucracy at Kazan' handled the students very badly. They were horrified by the student corporatism, but the severe measures they took were often uncoordinated and they frequently lacked the will to stand behind them; a heavy turnover in personnel ensued. Without any "liberal" and supportive public opinion in Kazan', the students felt genuinely under siege by late 1859. The appointment of Prince Viazemsky as curator eased the strain a bit; he actively and successfully promoted the Sunday Schools as an outlet for student social idealism. But in the fall of 1860, when Shchapov took up his post as instructor in Russian history, tensions were still high.

We do not know whether Shchapov's reputation had preceded him at the university, but he was known at least to the faculty historians and to some of the students. In any event, Shchapov electrified the audience at his first lecture by his first words:

I want to say immediately that I have no intention of appearing on a university rostrum with thoughts on the subject of the state principle or with ideas about centralization, but with ideas about nationality (*narodnost'*) and regionalism. In our time the conviction has to all appearances already taken hold that the *narod* itself is the principal factor in history, that the essence and content of history is the life of the *narod*.²⁵

A dramatic moment—here was this young seminarian, with his Asiatic features, wild hair, and exalted manner, proclaiming his intention to take on Solov'ëv and all the statist Olympians, past and present, in the name of the *narod*! To the more politically minded of the Kazan' students, scarred by their battles with old fogies, mediocrities, and conservatives on the faculty, Shchapov must have seemed the demiurge of the present moment, and indeed his success at the university was immediate and virtually total.

Shchapov continued his informal ways: students were in and out of his apartment at all hours, talking, eating, drinking, and borrowing books. And initially, at least, Shchapov appeared regularly on the podium, to receive admiration and attention from

this more politically receptive (and somewhat less well prepared) audience.

Some of his increasing radicalism found direct expression. One day in the winter, he announced his intention to lecture on the Decembrists—a daring proposition, even at the height of the new era. The students gasped—and word was quickly brought to the administration. On the announced day, one of the curator's assistants walked in and ostentatiously seated himself at the back of the hall. Shchapov pulled a small and rather smudged piece of paper from his pocket, stuck it back in again, then pulled it out, smiled, and talked for an hour in a rather conversational way about the Decembrists, ending, however, with some verses about how the *narod* would bring liberty to Russia in the end. This performance was received with long and stormy applause, and the administration decided to ignore the incident.

On occasion, Shchapov would meet with groups of students in someone's apartment and discuss contemporary ideas and problems with them. One November evening he spoke revealingly about his ideas for a "Russian constitution."²⁶ His point of view was profoundly antistatist—both "liberal" and Romantic. He spoke of freedom—of thought, speech, and labor—in terms that recalled French Revolutionary oratory. He spoke of a series of regionally based, elective assemblies that would culminate in a revived *Zemskii sobor*. But neither the government nor the intelligentsia would draw up a constitution—the people, which had always been the source of creativity in Russian history, would do that. All the government had to do was free the people, while the intelligentsia might provide some advice to ensure the orderly embodiment of the people's genius in institutional form. The amount of damage that had been done the *narod* by political and economic oppression was something that Shchapov was not then willing to confront, or able to understand.

Sometimes he sounded a genuinely revolutionary note; a constant theme of his evening discussions was his longing for a fusion of the intellectual radicalism of *obshchestvo* with the elemental force of popular democracy, of Western consciousness with homegrown peasant rebelliousness. "Will the time soon come,"

he said in words that recall Bakunin, "that holy time when Pugachëv, the motive force of the popular masses, will give his hand to the Decembrist Murav'ëv or Pestel or Petrashevsky, when the grave, sad sounds of the people's songs will blend with the songs and thoughts of Ryleev?"*²⁷

Like that of so many other Populist radicals, Shchapov's interest in ethnography had grown, and he had become almost obsessed with the history of peasant rebellion, with bandits—in fact, with all manifestations of the *narod's* hostility to the existing order. He frequently speculated—that winter when the Emancipation finally became law—on when some new manifestation of popular fury might take place, and what form it might take.

And yet at other times Shchapov would speak as if a renewal of the monarchy might yet be possible, as if one might still appeal directly to the Little Father with some hope of success. The notion of the Tsar Liberator died harder than it is easy for us to comprehend. Herzen, Bakunin—even Chernyshevsky, for a moment—entertained it. No educated Russian could be unaffected by the titanic role played by the autocracy in Russian history; least of all could its enemies forget what it had done for, as well as to, Russia.

As the winter of 1861 drew on, Shchapov's mood seems to have become more gloomy and strained; it is not clear why. Perhaps, as Aristov suggests, he was growing weary of and cynical about the political adulation he was receiving, and yearned for the scholar's workroom.²⁸ Did disappointment with the terms of the Emancipation have some part? Or was it simply physical debilitation, stemming from alcoholism? In any case, he put in a request to the university administration for a year's leave of absence to work in the archives of Moscow and St. Petersburg, to meet other historians, and to fill gaps in his historical education. But before his request could be acted upon, came the news of the shootings at Bezdna.

*Kondraty Ryleev was a Decembrist poet who had been hanged in 1826. The reference to his "thoughts" also refers to the collection of his poems, *Dumy*, the Russian word being somewhere between "thoughts" and "meditations."

In April 1861,²⁹ one Anton Petrov, a peasant from the village of Bezdna, southeast of Kazan' on a tributary of the Volga, set himself up as an interpreter of the Emancipation statutes that had been delivered to the village a few days before. Episodes involving interpretation of the statutes were quite common in the Russian villages, not only because of the prevalent illiteracy of the peasants, the arcane and archaic language of the statutes, and their length and complexity, but above all because the gap was so great between the actual terms of the Emancipation and the "liberty" (*volia*) the peasants believed they were receiving. In many areas the belief was widespread that *volia* had been granted by the Tsar long before but that this fact had been concealed by the "lords," "boyars," or "officials" (such terms generally being employed interchangeably). If the peasants understood a passage in the statutes but did not like what they heard, the reader might be dismissed; it might be said that he read "well enough" but interpreted everything as favoring the lords. In discussing these matters, Daniel Field offers the trenchant observation of the British historian Eric Hobsbawm: for peasants, "the refusal to understand is a form of class struggle."³⁰

There was thus enormous pressure on those who read the statutes to the villagers to "find the true *volia*," to interpret the statutes in a manner that would conform to the expectations of the listeners. In this case, Petrov, a literate Old Believer, claimed to have found "true liberty" in certain of the statistics that studied the statutes, and peasants began to flock to Bezdna, in ever larger numbers, to hear him render the truth of their freedom.

It is immensely difficult to establish, from conflicting reports of involved participants and ex post facto accounts, what the threat of violence actually was, or the degree of insubordination, or even whether Petrov had put himself forward as the Tsar's anointed. He *seems* to have done no more than advocate that the peasants refuse their continuing economic obligations to their landlords. But the government was panicky, troops were sent, and when on April 12 the soldiers confronted some thousands of Petrov's followers at Bezdna, they refused to surrender their leader. Eventually, a series of volleys was fired into the crowd,

resulting, it has been calculated, in the death of some two hundred peasants, although no remotely accurate estimate of the number of dead was possible at the time.

Confused reports of this dreadful event were quickly brought back to Kazan', with an effect on the students there analogous in some ways to the impact on American college students of the shootings at Kent State University in 1969, if on a much smaller and more local scale. And, as we have seen, Shchapov (along with many other radicals) had been "expecting" something of this sort. Indeed, there is a curious congruence between his attitude and that of the provincial governor and the other authorities: they all were expecting Pugachëv, however differently they understood what that meant. No one involved in the situation at Bezdna was in a position to respond to events with dispassion, a cool head, or even minimal objectivity.

As soon as the news had gotten back to the city, students from the university and the academy set about organizing a requiem Mass, in which their sentiments of outrage and solidarity with the victims could be expressed in a fashion that would make interference or retribution from the authorities difficult. The requiem took place on April 17, with student-priests as celebrants. Given Shchapov's relationship to the more radical students, it is likely enough that he had a hand in arranging the service (which took place in the city cemetery), but he denied it subsequently. In any event, after the service was over, he stepped forward in a state of violent agitation (perhaps increased by alcohol) and made a brief speech. The most plausible version of it runs as follows:

My friends, killed for the *narod*!

The democrat Christ, heretofore the mythical God created by humankind in Europe, to whose sufferings men will prostrate themselves in the forthcoming holy week, proclaimed communal-democratic liberty to the world in the era of the yoke of the Roman Empire and of the slavery of nations, and for this he was nailed to the cross by Pilate's court-martial, and so became the redemptive sacrifice for the whole world's liberty.

In Russia, for the past century and a half, among the bitterly suffering, dark mass of the *narod*, among you *muzhiki*, your own Christs

have appeared—democratic conspirators. Since the middle of the last century they have come to be called prophets, and the *narod* has believed in them as redeemers and liberators. Once again such a prophet has appeared and you, my friends, were the first to answer his summons and to fall as the redemptive victims of despotism, sacrificed for the liberty that the *narod* has awaited so long. You were the first to disturb our sleep, to destroy by your initiative our unjust doubts that our *narod* is capable of taking an initiative in political movements. Louder than the tsar and more nobly than the noble, you said to the *narod*: let thy servant go in peace. The land you worked, whose fruits nourished us, which you now wanted to acquire as your property, and which has now taken you into its bosom as martyrs—this land will summon the *narod* to rebellion and to liberty. Peace to your dust, and eternal historical memory to your selfless deed! Long live a democratic constitution!³¹

As soon as the provincial governor got wind of what had happened, he cabled St. Petersburg about the service and about Shchapov's speech. Tsar Alexander himself took a considerable interest in the proceedings. After extensive discussions among various government agencies, and after the first reports of Shchapov's interrogation in Kazan' had been received in the capital, the Emperor's initial decision was reaffirmed: Shchapov should be arrested. But in order to prevent student demonstrations or other disruptive events, Shchapov was merely told that he was to go to St. Petersburg and justify himself, and the curator, Prince Viazemsky, gave him two hundred rubles for expenses.³² On April 29, Shchapov was escorted to the dock by a crowd of student well-wishers. When the steamboat reached Nizhny Novgorod, agents from the Third Section came aboard and put Shchapov officially under arrest.

There was nothing the Russian government feared so much, in the summer of 1861, as major peasant disturbances in which intellectuals would take a hand; and what the government feared, many radicals tried to promote. Land and Liberty, the first "national" network of radicals and sympathizers, was put together precisely for this eventuality. This being the case, the interest that the Emperor showed in Shchapov, from the first news of the requiem in Kazan', is hardly surprising. When Shchapov arrived

in the capital, he was questioned extensively by agents of the Third Section, and he remained under arrest for almost four months, spending some weeks in a hospital, presumably undergoing treatment for alcoholism. After the initial round of questioning was over and it was beginning to be clear that Shchapov did not represent a well-oiled revolutionary conspiracy, the prisoner was given the opportunity he had long desired to address Tsar Alexander directly.

The rather lengthy letter that he wrote has survived.³³ In analyzing it, one cannot, of course, forget the circumstances under which it was written or lose sight of the elements of hypocrisy and dissimulation that it contains. Nevertheless, the curious blend of naive Slavophile monarchism with a kind of liberalism seems honestly to reflect Shchapov's beliefs at the time—or at least what we might call his "best case" analysis of the situation.

The letter, in essence, summons Alexander to be what he is supposed to be: the father of the *narod*. It calls upon him to end Russia's undemocratic and destructive organization by estate and to create a classless, "democratic" monarchy, in which the long-suppressed genius of the Russian people could flower. Shchapov thought this ambitious goal could be accomplished by liberating the *narod* from gentry-bureaucratic oppression, and then by promoting a modern version of the ancient communal governing forms, plus making a major commitment of capital for all-class schools, universities, and financial and credit institutions—all regionally organized but funded by the government.

With this massive but sketchy (and highly utopian) program, we are at a curious juncture, where Romantic Slavophile-Populism borders on a kind of liberalism not often found in Russia. The Slavophile idealization of the peasantry's capacity, the belief in them as a treasure house of religious harmony, is beginning to look a bit red. The Slavophile monarchy—benevolent, patriarchal, but limited, which does not interfere in the life of society—is to make the resources available for the people's genius to develop; it is not to force or even define the course of that development.

At the same time, Shchapov—as a poor, ambitious scion of a clerical-peasant family—regards the *narod* as a reservoir of all kinds of ability, and stresses the need to create a situation where careers will indeed be open to talent. This kind of social optimism was possible during the flood tide of the time; Shchapov's letter was one of the final attempts by a Russian radical to persuade the monarchy to reform the country—root and branch—from above. In the more bitter and polarized politics of the 1860s, such appeals were bound to come to an end; indeed, the naiveté of his proposal was striking even in 1861.

We can see Shchapov's Slavophilism becoming Populism in another way. When Kireevsky, Khomiakov, and the other early Slavophiles denounce the bureaucracy, they do so in part as representatives of an older landed elite, whose power has been eroded by the rationalizing autocracy and its bureaucratic agents. For them, as for Shchapov, the *narod* has preserved the essential values of religious faith, communal organizations, and a traditional way of life, but they never suggest that the *narod* can develop these qualities by itself, tacitly assuming that an elite of some kind (gentry or intelligentsia) must do that. But for Shchapov the people's genius need only be unfettered and supported to fulfill its destiny. He makes no distinction between new and old landed elites. All are rapacious and parasitic; all have come between the Tsar and his people.

Shchapov denied, at the outset of his letter, that it was a "political address"; "God preserve me from the very thought," he wrote with pious hypocrisy. But his idea for the recreation (or creation) of tiers of conciliar agencies—*narodosovetie*, or popular councilship, he called it—would in fact create a kind of constitutional monarchy. Indeed, the old Slavophile concept of a Tsar who conducted foreign relations but "did not interfere in the life of society" was already very different from the actual Russian autocracy. Any attempt to breathe life into the Romantic, traditionalist phrase was bound to issue in some kind of limitation on existing monarchical sovereignty. Alexander responded predictably. "All this shows what kind of ideas prevail with him," he

wrote in the margin of the letter, "and that it will be necessary to watch him carefully when we consider it possible to set him at liberty."³⁴

Watch him carefully they did. He was released from custody in August, although the threat of incarceration in the Solovetsky Monastery hung over his head for a time. But Alexander overruled the Holy Synod, which had claimed the right to try and to punish Shchapov as a member of the clerical estate. Instead, he was deprived of his position at the University of Kazan', forbidden as well to teach at the Ecclesiastical Academy—and given a job at the Ministry of the Interior! Ironically enough, the notion of lodging him in the midst of the bureaucracy he so detested may have originated in Shchapov's own letter to Alexander. In the concluding paragraph he had asked specifically not to be sent back to Kazan', but for a "little corner" to do his work in St. Petersburg, and a modest sum of money to arrange the publication of his works and to treat "the illness which is torturing me"—presumably alcoholism.

In August, Shchapov went to work in a small office of the Ministry of the Interior, charged with responsibility for the affairs of the Old Believers, under the supervision of the minister himself, P. A. Valuev. He was apparently paid some kind of a salary; according to Aristov, he got six hundred rubles for the eleven months during which he was "employed" at the ministry.³⁵ Despite the fact that he was free to do research at government expense, Shchapov was not happy. He was enraged by the bureaucrats and the bureaucratic mentality with which he now came in daily contact: he was constantly fuming about the "lifeless abstractions" by means of which the desiccated representatives of the central government attempted to understand the Russian people. It is more difficult to get the other side, but it seems that the people at the ministry found Shchapov a naive and finally irritating "crazy" with whom it was impossible to get on. Shchapov's temper was not improved by having to submit all his articles to a ministerial censorship, which came down on his purple prose with a heavy hand. He finally almost ceased coming

in to his office at the ministry and did his work in his apartment.

There was all the more reason for him to do so, as his St. Petersburg associations were scarcely such as would commend themselves to Valuev or his ministerial colleagues. The episode at Bezdna and Shchapov's part in it had caused a stir in St. Petersburg radical circles, the more so as his old teacher, Eliseev, was now an influential figure at the *Contemporary*. When it appeared that the Holy Synod might send Shchapov off to the monastery, Chernyshevsky was only the most notable of the radical journalists who were prepared to launch a public campaign on his behalf, should it be necessary. It was not. Shchapov was established as a new literary-political star on the horizon, and he was courted by journalists, writers, and historians who were involved with the opposition. He became friendly with A. N. Pypin, the ethnographer (and brother-in-law of Chernyshevsky), with Vasily Kurochkin, editor of the *Spark (Iskra)*. He had some contact with the historian N. I. Kostomarov, whose views were in many respects close to his own, and who may in fact have had some influence on him a few years previously. His friendship with N. G. Pomialovsky, author of *Seminary Sketches* (that stinging indictment of life in the bursa, which greatly appealed to Shchapov), ended in a stupid quarrel, as did so many of Shchapov's relationships in this period. Perhaps not surprisingly, Chernyshevsky remained aloof, despite Shchapov's frequently expressed desire to meet him. They finally spent a disastrous evening together in December 1861; the exact subject of their marathon disagreement is not known, but apparently Shchapov was kept off the *Contemporary* staff on the grounds that his views were too close to the Slavophiles', particularly his antistatism.³⁶

In addition to the "scholarly" articles that Shchapov published in the *Annals of the Fatherland* and other large-circulation journals, he produced a lengthy statement of his political views, undergirded by a certain amount of historical background. This "Letter to Prince Viazemsky," written in October 1861, subsequently turned up in Herzen's archives. It was never published and never submitted to the censor. Hence, although it was writ-

ten in anger, and the language is even more immoderate than usual, it may be taken to represent Shchapov's political position some five months after his far more circumspect communication with Tsar Alexander.³⁷

The letter is striking for its feverish tone and sense of impending apocalypse. It was written just as the universities were going up in smoke and the mood in St. Petersburg was inflamed to a degree. Shchapov clearly expected a major social transformation soon, but despite his harsh words about the Russian autocracy, he did not rule out the possibility that this transformation might proceed under monarchical auspices. He told Viazemsky that Russia was on the eve of a revival of "the land," of the achievement of "popular councilship": communal, regional, federal, and democratic. He gave a confused, angry, and ecstatic evocation of the Russia of the future, governed by a great hierarchy of communes, culminating in the *Zemskii sobor*. The motive force of the new order would be the "new generation," those who had attended the requiem in Kazan': students, intellectuals, peasants, and schismatics.

He then launched into a fervid denunciation of all those forces in Russian life that had so cruelly oppressed the *narod* since the seventeenth century, pouring his sentences out onto the page. The *narod* elected the Romanovs, who then usurped absolute power. The Church lost its communal spirit and became Byzantine and hierarchical. The gentry developed, after Peter the Great, into Germanized petty tyrants whose oppression of the people only increased with the passage of time. The Old Believers, the more extreme of the sectarians, and peasant rebels like Stenka Razin and Pugachëv were the true representatives of the *narod* in its struggle against centralized despotism.

The real focus of Shchapov's denunciation was Peter the Great, who in these pages achieved the status of arch-villain of Russian history that he had occupied in the work of the Slavophiles Ivan Kireevsky and Konstantin Aksakov. Shchapov called him the "German-Russian genius," the first Emperor (as opposed to Tsar), the destroyer of Russia's "natural-historical development." For the "truth of the *narod*" he substituted "truth as the monarch's

will.”*³⁸ Peter bureaucratized Russia and brought to the country the “abstract,” German conception of the state. Senate, colleges, and all those ramshackle Western institutions were imposed on the country, at a moment when Russia’s communal institutions should have been developed. (All this happened, Shchapov wrote, in a rather simpleminded way, because Peter was raised by Germans and traveled to the West in his youth, instead of traveling around his own country and seeing how it worked.) So Peter became the Antichrist to large portions of his own people, Old Believers and sectarians.

So what now? If the Tsar were not to face the awful “day of the people’s judgment,” he must himself restore the communal self-government and self-development of the land. If *narodosovetie* were not proclaimed, if the Tsar did not renounce the Petrine autocracy, a “most terrible Russian revolution” was a certainty.

Such a cry of rage could not, of course, be published anywhere under Shchapov’s name, nor was it sent to Viazemsky. Shchapov’s friends apparently talked him out of doing either. But it was circulated in manuscript, and a few months later it was sent to Herzen in London (who might have published it anonymously, but did not) by people close to the *Contemporary*.

Much of Shchapov’s energies, in late 1861 and early 1862, went into the *Century* (*Vek*), a journal edited by Eliseev but run along cooperative lines by an artel of radical writers.³⁹ The *Century* in fact lasted barely ten weeks, but Shchapov was a central figure in the journal: not only did he publish fifteen articles, far more than anyone else, but together with Nikolai Shelgunov and Eliseev, he gave the *Century* its particular flavor: a perceptibly nativist, Slavophile kind of Populism, with a strong sense of Russia’s uniqueness. In his articles, Shelgunov tried to define how Russia’s future industrialization might be rural and based on the peasant commune, rather than upon a network of urban factories, as in the West. Eliseev tried to demonstrate the socialist potentialities of the Russian peasant, while Shchapov wrote a

*A reference to Feofan Prokopovich’s justification of the Petrine monarchy, *The Justice of the Monarch’s Will* (1722). The Russian word *pravda* meant both “truth” and “justice,” with just a hint of “law,” too.

series of articles on "popular councilship" in Russian history, with an eye to its recrudescence in the immediate future. Individuals from *obshchestvo* Russia, he felt, if they were to be midwives to the new Russia, had to study the *narod* and its history; when they were sufficiently steeped in it, they might join with the people in the renewed *Zemskii sobor*.

One of the *Century*'s great difficulties was its political diversity. Among the participants were radical bohemians like P. I. Iakushkin, and political moderates like the novelist N. S. Leskov and K. K. Arsen'ev (subsequently the editor of the liberal *Messenger of Europe* [*Vestnik Evropy*]). But there were also would-be revolutionaries, like Nikolai Serno-Solov'evich, who were interested in the *Century* only because they hoped it might be of some use to Land and Liberty. The militant but nonrevolutionary nativism of Eliseev and Shchapov was not satisfactory to a number of contributors, and several criticized Eliseev for being an authoritarian editor who did not understand the cooperative principles upon which the contributors had agreed to base the journal. On April 29, 1862, the last issue appeared.

The most important creation of Shchapov's St. Petersburg period (and arguably of his entire career) was *The Land and the Schism* (*Zemstvo i raskol*), which came out in two parts in the fall of 1862. Despite its rhetorical exaggeration, repetitiveness, and organizational chaos, *The Land and the Schism* was a major landmark in the historiography of the Russian Church Schism. From it are descended not only the numerous Populist and Marxist treatments of the Schism, but really *all* accounts that deal with it as in some part a social movement. With the advent of "modernization theory" as a rubric for studying Russian development, Shchapov's point of view has again become influential.⁴⁰

These two small volumes* constitute Shchapov's most enduring attack on the Russian autocracy and its works. In its pro-

*Part I of *Zemstvo i raskol* appeared as a small book in St. Petersburg in the fall of 1862; Part II came out at about the same time in the journal of the Dostoevsky brothers, *Time* (*Vremia*). The latter journal, though reasonably catholic in the material published, was not in the habit of printing radical polemics or material offensive to the government. The appearance of Shchapov's monograph in *Time* is indicative of its interest to religious and nationalist circles, as well as radical ones. The entire work is reprinted in A. P. Shchapov, *Sochineniia*, Vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 451-579.

foundly Manichaean attitude, in its glorification of both schismatics and peasant insurrectionaries, *The Land and the Schism* stands in sharp contrast to Shchapov's dissertation, *The Russian Schism of the Old Ritualists*, which had been published only four years earlier. Shchapov, like other Russian radicals, had come a long way in that short time.

Although Shchapov was nominally writing about the Schism in the Church and the dissenters who had emerged from it, the "schism" with which he was really concerned was a larger and even more important event: the split between the land (*zemstvo*) and the increasingly bureaucratized Russian state of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Church Schism became a mere symptom, albeit an important one. As he did in other essays, Shchapov began in 1613 with the election of the Romanov dynasty by the *Zemskii sobor*, when, he claimed, the revival of the democratic communalism of the land had saved Russia from social and political chaos. Without much exaggeration, one can say that in Shchapov's view Russian history had been all downhill from there.

Most of the damage was done, Shchapov had come to believe, in the reigns of Tsar Aleksei (1645–76) and under Peter the Great (1682–1725). Although Shchapov used a very Slavophile vocabulary in indicting Aleksei and Peter, his main focus was on the accelerating economic, political, and cultural oppression of the Russian lower orders by the more and more Westernized gentry elite. As the Romanovs infringed on Russia's benevolent patriarchal, limited monarchy and her regional-communal-democratic "councils"*—what amounted to an Old Russian constitution, although Shchapov does not use the term—they turned to the West for help in shaping the new institutions that would buttress their arbitrary rule: an "abstract" concept of the state, Scandinavian and German government institutions, and a culture derived first from Protestant Northern Europe and then from France. This way of putting it suggests the kind of attack on Enlighten-

*Recent research has not given us reason to believe that any such network of regional councils existed in the seventeenth century. Peasant communes undoubtedly *did* exist, although some of the practices most striking to Populists like Shchapov (such as the periodic repartition of land) became widespread only in the eighteenth century.

ment cosmopolitanism that was made so often by European Romantics after Burke and adapted for use in Russia by the Slavophiles. But it was not the state that destroyed the boyar aristocracy to which Shchapov was opposed, but the state that had enserfed and cretinized the Russian *narod*, a difference that substantially demarcates the ideological feeling of his attack on "the West" from that of his Slavophile forebears. He dwells on the repressiveness of serfdom; on the increase in taxes; on the development of caste spirit; on the maiming of the old regionalism through the imposition of new and arbitrary provincial and district boundaries.

In their ideological criticism, the Slavophiles subtly echoed the aristocratic social groups who had long ago been defeated by, or drawn into the orbit of, the autocracy; Shchapov performed the same function for the hundreds of thousands of peasants who fled that autocracy in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. He did not exactly speak "for" them (although that was in part his intention), but his democratic Slavophilism would have been impossible without the overwhelming fact of their experience, those "miserable cockroach journeyings," in Gorky's memorable phrase.

Shchapov was of two minds about Russian culture. On the one hand, he wanted to argue that the culture of the *narod* was superior to that of *obshchestvo*, just as the land was morally and culturally superior to the world of *obshchestvo* that the state had created. But he couldn't quite persuade himself of this any longer. In his later work, Shchapov would make no bones about the cultural backwardness in which centuries of serfdom had left the *narod*, and already we can find traces of this point of view in his writing: one minute he is praising the culture of the *narod*; the next he is indicting Peter the Great for the ignorance in which he left the masses.⁴¹

Faced with this kind of economic and political oppression, the people of the land could do two things: run away or revolt. In fact they did both. They had recourse to brigandage and banditry, for which Shchapov offered a social interpretation: this was one way that the creatures of the state could be resisted. Of the numerous

popular revolts of the seventeenth century, he singled out the enormous rebellion associated with the name of Stenka Razin and the abortive rebellion of the traditionalist Moscow guards, the *Strel'tsy* (meaning archers, musketeers, "shooters") against Peter the Great; he stressed the connection of both with the Old Believers. Even more fundamental to the popular response was flight; modern scholarship has amply confirmed the stress that Shchapov laid on those who simply ran away from the heavy burdens of serfdom and military service. Indeed, the cossack hosts, that distinctive Russian phenomenon, were the result of a fusion of two cultures: Slavic peasants, fleeing their governmental and gentry persecutors, and the remnants of the once-powerful Tatar (Mongol) hordes on the periphery of the Russian state.

Rebellion and flight combined and recombined within the Schism. Clerics, peasants, merchants (and a very few members of the upper class) refused to accept the corrected Church books; after revolts, violent resistance, and self-immolation, those who stuck by the uncorrected books either fled to out-of-the-way parts of the realm or adhered to secret religious communities in the larger cities.

The most militant and extreme in this refusal of the Church and the state that supported it were the so-called Wanderers (*Beguny, Stranniki*). Shchapov had solid grounds for his belief that they were religious, unself-conscious anarchists; modern scholarship has largely confirmed his description of their lives, even if they were less numerous than he supposed. They refused to live in a world that—the Russian Church having fallen into apostasy—they believed was ruled by the Antichrist: in effect, Peter the Great and his successors on the throne of Russia. As they were (literally) homeless in this world, their lives came to be spent on the road, in "wandering" or "running." The effect was to lend an apocalyptic religious sanction to the previously existing phenomenon of peasant flight. Because the image of the Antichrist was stamped on Russian coins, they could not use money, nor for the same reason could they carry the Russian internal passport. (Many of them did carry passports of a kind—often inscribed with a prayer, or a parody of the Antichrist's

passport, or a "letter" from God.) More recently, the Wanderers had come to be supported by a network of sympathizers who maintained facilities in their homes or places of business to put up their more militant coreligionists. At the end of their lives many of these fellow travelers would sell their possessions and engage in some kind of (often quite symbolic) "travel," or at least be carried out into their gardens to die, so that they should not be "at home" when the end came.

In addition to the Wanderers, others of the extreme Protestant sects, as well as the Old Believers, were of interest to Russian radicals in the 1860s and 1870s. Just as the peasant rebels of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were conceived to be "primitive rebels" (to use Hobsbawm's phrase), the opposition of these sectarians to Church and state was regarded as a kind of primitive or unself-conscious anarchism. And the hope of many intellectuals was, of course, that class consciousness could be achieved without any loss in militancy; in other words, that not only could these representatives of the *narod* be won for the cause of the radical intelligentsia, but that, in a deep sense, the two groups would turn out to be brothers under the skin and the split between the *narod* and *obshchestvo* could, through common opposition to the state, be healed. This was an ingenious and inspiring pipe dream, it turned out, but only the ideologically unsympathetic could see such things clearly in 1862. Precisely at this time, V. I. Kel'siev and Ogarëv were putting together a special supplement to the *Bell* in London; entitled the *Popular Assembly (Obshchee veche)*, it was intended as propaganda for agents of Land and Liberty in Russia, for use among Old Believers and sectarians; although little came of Kel'siev's dreams and projects, Russian intellectuals made a number of similar attempts over the next several decades.

Like most of these *intelligenty*, Shchapov was not, by this time, interested in the religious issues of the Schism at all; indeed, he called the actual beliefs of the Wanderers (presumably notions like the rule of the Antichrist in Russia) "twaddle." Of course, that was not the point, for beneath the religious phraseology, within the religious hull, was the social and democratic kernel.

The Schism was *really* a revolt of the most militant members of the land against the reforms of Peter the Great and against the virtual destruction of the old culture of Russia. The Schism was not essentially a religious phenomenon, despite the fact that the land had only a religious vocabulary in which to make its protest. Shchapov called the decision of an Old Believer community not to pray for the Tsar "democratic." As the Wanderers were the most militant and extreme representatives of the land point of view (fugitive soldiers seem often to have gravitated toward the Wanderers and their network of "safe houses"), Shchapov naturally dwelt on them.

Shchapov found proof of the close connection between the land and the Schism in the fact that the culture of the schismatics closely resembled Russia's communal and regional culture before Peter the Great. Discovering on occasion what he wanted to discover, Shchapov found that the Schism gave the land the opportunity of recreating the old world in a real, if limited, fashion: there was a regional element within the Schism, and regional differences between communities; the Schism spread through colonization; and the old communal and conciliar forms appeared within the structure of the schismatic communities. Finally, various regions and communities kept in touch with each other in ways that Shchapov viewed as closely akin to the "federative" principle of Old Russia.

The second half of 1862 was a time of personal stress for Shchapov. The government offensive of the summer, and particularly the closing of the journals and the arrest of Chernyshevsky, affected all Russian radicals, and Shchapov's social life suffered a special blow with the closing of the Chess Club, upon which he had heavily depended for human contact. It may be doubted that he suffered correspondingly as a result of losing his job at the ministry, but his dismissal was politically ominous as well as entailing financial loss. Aristov reports that throughout this period Shchapov's drunkenness grew worse; he may have stopped working almost entirely. When he was lonely and in his cups, Shchapov would simply take to the streets in search of society.

X His hatred of uniforms (especially military ones) had grown so great that he would sometimes pursue officers and uniformed bureaucrats upon whom he happened in his wanderings and abuse them drunkenly. On other occasions he would try to find peasants to sing folk songs for him, or talk for hours with cabdrivers, after which he would give them extravagant tips. At the same time he grew more cynical about the *narod* and began to talk about the loss of spirit and initiative that the Russian people had suffered through their long subjection to the state.⁴²

Shchapov might have gotten into serious trouble with the law or continued his steady physical and psychological decline had he not finally met the woman who—it is no exaggeration to say—became his salvation, as well as his wife, lover, nurse, and research assistant. Her name was Ol'ga Ivanovna Zhemchuzhnikova, and she was from a clerical family. Her father had been a poor teacher, but she had been orphaned at an early age and raised by a rich and affectionate uncle who had let her go her own way. The way she decided upon included considerable education and sympathy for advanced political ideas, including feminism. Zhemchuzhnikova was an energetic, intelligent, rather plain person—highly sensible and practical, but with a deep sympathy for all unfortunates, most of all for the poor and oppressed. Then as now, such sympathies could easily become radical and political if the atmosphere were propitious. Zhemchuzhnikova had read a number of Shchapov's articles, and on that politically admirable basis she decided she wished to make his acquaintance. Aristov, who introduced the two, reports that she had wept after reading of the plight of the eighteenth-century peasantry in *The Land and the Schism*; he also recalls showing her Shchapov's picture, and that she was impressed by his "long, wavy hair."⁴³ They met around Christmas, 1862, and their relationship developed rapidly throughout the following year. When Shchapov discovered that he was to be sent to Siberia, she instantly declared her intention to accompany him. Her willingness to share his fate lessened the initial trauma of exile, and, once in Siberia, her presence made life possible.

For Shchapov discovered in the fall of 1862 that the authorities

had not forgotten him. The previous July, a pair of Herzen's couriers had been caught entering Russia with letters and messages for a number of people; others were mentioned in more or less compromising ways in letters and documents. Chernyshevsky was the most prominent victim of the "affair of the London propagandists" (although Herzen's message to him was merely the occasion of his arrest, not its cause); Turgenev was also harassed for many months; and some thirty people were eventually brought to trial. One of those who turned up in the police dragnet was a man called Nichiporenko, who appears to have relied on the sheer volume of information he turned over to the police to save him. Among those whom he implicated was Shchapov. As we know, Herzen *had* written to Shchapov; someone, although probably not Shchapov himself, had sent the "Letter to Prince Viazemsky" to London; and in addition there were striking similarities between Shchapov's interests and those of Kel'siev, the most prominent recent addition to Herzen's ménage, in whom the authorities were interested. Still, Nichiporenko changed his story several times; Shchapov faced him down in an oral confrontation, and after a time the investigation seemed to lapse.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, Shchapov had made some new enemies with the publication of *The Land and the Schism*. Andrei Nikolaevich Murav'ëv, an elderly and conservative church historian (with excellent connections in the upper bureaucracy), called Shchapov's viewpoint "real communism" and wrote letters of denunciation to a number of highly placed persons, including the minister of the interior.⁴⁵ Before the new year of 1863 was many weeks old, Shchapov had been informed by some government representatives—it is not certain by whom—that if he wished to avoid immediate arrest and exile, he would have to go into the clinic run by Professor Zablotsky (which had facilities for treating prisoners and people under surveillance) and undergo treatment for alcoholism and general physical debility. For the next few months he was lodged in several hospitals and clinics, under the care of various medical men. He was allowed to visit specific friends by day, but had to be back at night in the hospital. The

friends whom he visited had to guarantee that he would return to the hospital.

The year 1863 was a strange one for Shchapov. He collaborated with Eliseev and Antonovich on the short-lived journal *Essays (Ocherki)* while moving from hospital to hospital; his political fate was uncertain. The only real security in his life came from his close relationship with Zhemchuzhnikova. His ideas changed rapidly in this period, as can be seen from a piece that appeared in the *Contemporary Word (Sovremennoe slovo)* as early as January 1863. Entitled "The New Era: On the Boundary of Two Millennia,"⁴⁶ the article revealed a new and strong affinity for intelligentsia elitism, and a sharp diminution in Shchapov's veneration for the people. Picking up themes he had broached a year ago in *The Land and the Schism*, Shchapov turned them completely around. Despite the great achievements of the Russian people, he wrote, they stood in dire need of European culture—in particular, scientific culture, which must be brought to them by the educated minority, primarily by the representatives of *obshchestvo* in the two capitals. Shchapov also reversed himself by declaring that of the two intellectual tendencies of the previous generation, he now chose Westernism over Slavophilism, which like the world of the Old Believers was fatally tainted with futile nostalgia for dead forms of life. The educated minority must bring European culture not only to the Russian masses but also to the peoples of the East, who stood in even greater need of it. If the Russian elite were successfully to accomplish this mission, "Europe will recognize Russia as a great nation." (This naive vision of Russia as *Kulturträger* in the Orient curiously anticipates the kind of imperial program later developed by the Sino-logue V. P. Vasil'ev and other spokesmen for Russian expansion in Asia, most of whom, like Shchapov, had undergone some kind of Slavophile influence.⁴⁷) By spring, Shchapov was almost obsessed with his own (and the Russian people's) ignorance of the natural sciences—particularly, at that time, astronomy. His journalism of the period reveals an exacerbated scientism: he came to admire Pisarev, and after reading Buckle's historical works, he longed to rewrite Russian history along the lines of the natural

sciences—stressing climate, geography, topography, and what Buckle grandiloquently called “the General Aspect of Nature.”

Some Soviet historians (the late M. N. Pokrovsky among them) have expressed a restrained enthusiasm for Shchapov’s discovery of “historical materialism,” but to most observers Shchapov’s later work is markedly inferior to that of his Slavophile-Populist period in originality and imagination, if not in energy.

What is one to make of such a rapid and dramatic change of view? Eliseev (who was greatly annoyed by it) quite properly stressed the quality of *conversion* and the naive science-worship with which Shchapov’s later work is suffused: “as soon as Shchapov mastered some new scientific fact or other, he was immediately prepared to lay it at the base of Russian history and onesidedly derive all the events of that history from it.”⁴⁸ It is also true that the times were ripe for elitism: the people were disappointing the Left by failing to revolt, and radicals were now looking to other radicals (or education, or propaganda), not thinking that Stenka Razin would return, at least not any time soon. So Shchapov was in tune with the times. It is the rapidity of his conversion that needs explanation, rather than the new ideas themselves.

Shchapov had been feeling for some time that both he and the Russian people (and his identification of the two was strong) were suffering from provincialism and undereducation (the “ignorance of the seminary,” in his own words). It seems likely that this feeling had grown within him as he sought to leave Kazan’ for Moscow or St. Petersburg, and it had matured during his stay in the capital. Undoubtedly his semi-incarceration in a series of clinics and hospitals provided a climate conducive to a rethinking of things, and we have Shchapov’s own testimony that the doctors with whom he talked greatly reinforced his growing belief in science. It provided a curious note of contradiction in *The Land and the Schism* and finally came into the open in 1863.

The Shchapovs went into exile as a married couple in March 1864. Their initial destination was the village of Anga, Shchapov’s birthplace, but they were soon granted permission to live in Irkutsk, where the solitude was slightly less devastating. (Ironi-

cally enough, the Bakunins had been in exile there, but Mikhail had escaped some two years previously and his wife had joined him abroad less than a year before.) The Shchapovs had developed an optimistic, compensatory, hopeful view of Siberia as a healthy place, full of vitality, a place of the future where people might live in harmony with nature and where the writ of the state did not run. It was a view more in keeping with the ideas that Shchapov had abandoned than his new opinions about the West, science, and the importance of intellectuals; alas, there were few enough of those in Irkutsk, and little enough science. He continued to write—voluminously—although lack of access to libraries and up-to-date information led to abstractness and intellectual attenuation; his articles and surveys of Russian culture grew in ambition as they declined in specificity. He was able to go on a number of scientific expeditions to out-of-the-way regions, and his descriptions are considered a genuine contribution to the ethnography of Siberia.

Until the very end of his life, Shchapov continued to hope that he might be allowed to return to one of the major cities of European Russia, if not to Moscow or St. Petersburg, but his many letters to influential people failed to turn the trick. Less than a year after his arrival in Irkutsk, he was implicated in the activities of a group of Siberian separatists, although his accuser eventually abandoned the charge. But Shchapov's name was revered among the young radicals associated with the Kazan' area; his speech at the requiem circulated as a pamphlet, and his name turned up often in the testimony of arrested radicals and in the pages of letters that fell into the hands of the Third Section.⁴⁹ Taken together with his previous adventures, it is scarcely surprising that the government kept him in Siberia until the end.

The Shchapovs had gone into exile with substantial funds, provided by Ol'ga Ivanovna's rich uncle. Neither of them was good at handling money, however, and after her uncle's death they began a long, downward slide into destitution. Shchapov's travels and writings for the Russian Geographical Society were of some help, and Shchapova taught in the Irkutsk gymnasium from 1869 until her death in 1872, which helped much more. But after that,

Shchapov sank into a terrible melancholic stupor, aggravated by hunger and a recrudescence of alcoholism. The Siberian authorities were still sufficiently afraid of him to suppress all mention of his death, which came in February 1876, officially of tuberculosis, in the local press. It was many months before his friends back in European Russia knew that he was dead, and rumors circulated that he had died of starvation. In various ways, he had.

His final contact with the world of advanced European ideas came about through the exile of an energetic young radical named German Lopatin in Irkutsk, after he had tried and failed to rescue Chernyshevsky from Siberia. Lopatin hoped to arrange Shchapov's escape, after which he and Ol'ga Ivanovna would join Lopatin and Pëtr Lavrov in Zurich, where Lavrov was just getting his journal *Forward* (*Vperëd*) started. First Shchapov made difficulties because he didn't think that he could live outside of Russia; then, after Lopatin escaped and set out to arrange matters from abroad, their correspondence went astray through the carelessness of the courier. By the time orderly contact had been reestablished, Ol'ga Ivanovna was dead, and Shchapov refused to leave her grave.⁵⁰

From an intellectual point of view, Shchapov ought to be considered the antipode of Chernyshevsky: he embodied the Slavophile inheritance of Populism most fully, just as Chernyshevsky was the most "Western" of the early Populists. This means, of course, that Shchapov's pre-1863 writings were close to those of Herzen: they emphasized Russia's communal peasant culture, the separateness of that culture from *obshchestvo*, its revolutionary potential. And like Eliseev and other early Populists, Shchapov radicalized Slavophile nationalism into a kind of revolutionary messianism; in this, too, he is akin to Herzen, who stressed the notion that revolutionary Russia would follow a path separate from the West and perhaps redeem Western history.

In other respects, Shchapov anticipated the direction that Bakunin's thought took in the 1860s, after he escaped from Irkutsk and arrived in the West as an exile. (Although Shchapov's name does not figure significantly in the extant literature on

Bakunin, there is some evidence that his political and social interpretation of the Schism and of Stenka Razin's revolt was of great interest to Bakunin.⁵¹) For Shchapov's books and articles pushed Populist ideas further in the direction of anarchism than did any other body of work prior to Bakunin. The hatred of the state, characteristic of all the early Slavophiles, found its most powerful Populist expression in Shchapov and Bakunin. Social and moral virtue resided in the Russian people and in their communal and federal social institutions; the state was the tyrannical bearer of an antinational rationalism.

How important a figure was Shchapov to the young radicals who came after him? Vera Figner, a prominent member of the People's Will who wrote extensive memoirs after 1917, listed him, along with Herzen and Bakunin, as someone whose work helped her to understand the importance of the village commune.⁵² Georgy Plekhanov's Populist formulations (prior to his emigration and conversion to Marxism) clearly owe a debt to Shchapov, in the sharpness of the dualism between *obshchestvo* and the *narod*, in their historical grounding. When Aristov's biography of Shchapov appeared in 1883, Plekhanov reviewed it in an émigré radical journal.⁵³ Although he was at that time working his way out of Populism and into a somewhat schematic Marxism, Plekhanov treated Shchapov almost tenderly, as befitted a writer about whom he had cared. He called Shchapov's historical articles "really influential in the theory of Populism," but contrasted his naive counterposing of historical "principles" with the sophisticated analyses of Chernyshevsky, which he regarded as a long step toward the social democracy he was about to embrace.

In a recent book, S. Frederick Starr discussed Shchapov in a different context, which also deserves mention.⁵⁴ In the period after the Crimean War, the antistatism and hostility to bureaucracy so apparent in one wing of Populism was not confined to radicals. The creation of the zemstvos—agencies of local and provincial self-government—was only the principal manifestation of a generally critical attitude among respectable professors and bureaucrats, who would have been indignant to discover their names linked with Shchapov, let alone Bakunin! The ex-

traordinary role of the state in Russian national development is a central fact here; in periods when the policies shaped by bureaucratic centralism failed or faltered, various criticisms might emerge which were similar only in their final appeals to local autonomy and popular initiative. And the period after the Crimean War was such a period.

But the power of the state in Russian life was enormous. Just as provincialist ideology and provincial reform failed seriously to tilt the balance in favor of greater popular initiative, the federalist-anarchist emphasis in Populism was challenged in the 1860s (and repeatedly thereafter) by a revolutionary centralism just as despairing of and hostile to popular initiative as the bureaucracy of the Russian ancien régime.